```
1
2
3
5
6
7
8
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
                   FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
   SCOTT N. JOHNSON,
                                              2:08-cv-02060-GEB-EFB
12
                   Plaintiff,
                                              ORDER RE:
                                              NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT
13
              v.
   CABINET CRAFTERS, INC.; RICHARD
   G. LIVINGSTON, individually and as
   Trustee of the Livingston Family
15
   Irrevocable Trust; MICHAEL J.
   LIVINGSTON, individually and as
16
   Trustee of the Livingston Family
   Irrevocable Trust; LARRY L.
17
   LIVINGSTON, individually and as
   Trustee of the Livingston Family
18
   Irrevocable Trust,
19
                   Defendants.
20
21
              On November 21, 2008, Plaintiff filed a Notice of
22
```

On November 21, 2008, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Settlement in which he states: "the parties have settled this action" and a dispositional document will be filed within 20 calendar days. Therefore a dispositional document shall be filed no later than December 11, 2008. Failure to respond by this deadline may be construed as consent to dismissal of this action without prejudice, and a dismissal order could be filed. See L.R.

23

24

25

26

27

28

## Case 2:08-cv-02060-GEB-EFB Document 8 Filed 11/25/08 Page 2 of 2

16-160(b) ("A failure to file dispositional papers on the date prescribed by the Court may be grounds for sanctions.").

The status (pretrial scheduling) conference scheduled for December 12, 2008, is reset for hearing on January 20, 2009, at 9:00 a.m., in the event no dispositional document is filed, or if this action is not otherwise dismissed. Further, a Joint Status Report shall be filed fourteen days prior to the status (pretrial scheduling) conference.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 24, 2008

GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge

The status (pretrial scheduling) conference remains on calendar because the mere representation that an action has settled does not justify removing the action from the calendar. Cf. Callie  $\underline{v}$ . Near, 829 F.2d 888, 890 (9th Cir. 1987) (indicating that a representation that claims have been settled does not necessarily establish the existence of a binding settlement agreement).